

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, Claims 1-28 and 30-44 were pending in the Application. Claims 1, 4, 6-15, 18, 20-28, 30, 33, and 35-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hawley (PCT Publication No. WO 01/77822 A2). Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley in view of Secor et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0027845, hereafter Secor).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 1, 15 and 30, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-28 and 30-44. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, Claims 1, 4, 6-15, 18, 20-28, 30, 33, and 35-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hawley (PCT Publication No. WO 01/77822 A2).

Claim 1

Hawley discloses that a user-interface (963) of a device (903) renders a first object (360) and a second object (360), each object with data of a business application (300). (Abstract). It is a task of the [invention] to define a framework, wherein the framework defines classes of applications (300) that share a common user interface model. By defining a dedicated rendering statement (245) in application specification language, and by adapting an interpreter, the [invention] allows to create applications (300) for different types of computing devices (901/902/903), even if the device is not yet present when the application is developed. (Page 8, lines 25-35). Interpreter component 200 provides a basic user-interface framework. The framework comprises a navigation model, binding data to user-interface elements, data-services such as validation, inter-object relationships and navigation, data-event control, and capture of

data changes, and middleware services such as data synchronization, and virtual request-reply. (Page 14, lines 25-30). To set the value of an attribute of a particular element, the developer selects the element in tree-viewer 255 (cf. FIG. 6, FIG. 11). Workbench component 250 determines the list of all possible attributes for this element by inspection of AS-Language 260, and displays them in element attribute panel 255 of workbench component 250. (Page 35, line 33 to page 36, line 4).

Applicant respectfully submits that Hawley does not appear to disclose specifying a first action by a data binding tag wherein the first action includes reading or updating the information stored in the first data source. While Hawley appears to disclose an interpreter component that is used to provide a framework that comprises binding data to user-interface elements, and a workbench component (which appears to be a GUI, as shown in Figure 12) that may be used by a developer to set attribute values, neither of these components appears to be a data binding tag, as recited by Claim 1.

Additionally, in the Office Action it was asserted that Hawley discloses specifying, using a scripting language, at least one attribute on the data binding tag to reference the first data source associated with the first action. However, Applicant respectfully submits that, in Hawley, it appears that a user interface component can include multiple views of related business objects. However, Hawley does not appear to disclose specifying, using a scripting language, at least one attribute on the data binding tag. Claim 1 has been amended as shown above to more clearly recite the above features.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15, 30 and 44

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15 and 30 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6-14, 18, 20-28, 33 and 35-43

Claims 4, 6-14, 18, 20-28, 33 and 35-43 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 15, or 30. Claims 4, 6-14, 18, 20-28, 33 and 35-43 have not been addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4, 6-14, 18, 20-28, 33 and 35-43 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2009, Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawley in view of Secor (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0027845).

Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 15, or 30. Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 have not been addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-3, 5, 16-17, 19, 31-32, and 34 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 9, 2009

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800